

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/840,105	05/06/2004	Uwe Heinelt	DEA V2003/0047US NP 7287		
5487 ANDREA Q. F	7590 10/23/200 RYAN		EXAMINER		
-	NTIS U.S. LLC	· LOEWE, SUN JAE Y			
1041 ROUTE 2 MAIL CODE:		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
BRIDGEWAT		1626			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/23/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPatent.E-Filing@sanofi-aventis.com andrea.ryan@sanofi-aventis.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/840,105	HEINELT ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Sun Jae Y. Loewe	1626		

	Sun Jae Y. Loewe	1626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 October 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	•					
1. Mathematical The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause			
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		I E Delow);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	· · ·	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			•			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		Cont. Class and a				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wivided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
· Claim(s) allowed:	. 1					
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			-			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			-			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•		•			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	at does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	A 1				
13. ☑ Other: Interview Summary dated September 10, 2007.		1 m	)			
•		CCA ANDERSON				
	PRIN	MARY FXAMINER.				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: A prima facie case of obviousness was made based on the references cited. The references disclose a cyclization process comprising the same reaction steps as instantly claimed, albeit with the use of a different starting material (ie. oxygen as nucleophile). Furthermore, the reference suggests that this reaction may be carried out using different primary amines. Starting materials are available commercially that would produce heterocycles that fall into the scope of the claimed invention. One of ordinary skill in possession of the reference and the alternate starting materials would be motivated to practice the claimed invention with reasonable expectation of success. In re Surrey et al., 319 F2d 233, 138 USPQ 67 (the mere use of different starting materials in a conventional process to produce the product one would expect thereform does not render the process unobvious).

REBECCA ANDERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER